

\$~18

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

NEUTRAL CITATION NO: 2022/DHC/000575



%

Date of decision: 14.02.2022

+ **W.P.(C) 2781/2022**

KENDRIYA VIDYALAYA SANGATHAN Petitioner

Through: Mr Anil Nag with Mr Arun Singh,
Advocates.

versus

KOMENDRA PRAKASH GAUTAM & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr Devesh Chauvia, Advocate for
respondent no.1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE TALWANT SINGH

[Court hearing convened *via* video-conferencing on account of COVID-19]

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.(ORAL):-

CM APPL. 7980/2022

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 2781/2022

2. This writ petition is directed against the interim order dated 25.10.2021, as extended by orders dated 11.11.2021 and 21.12.2021, passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal [in short “the Tribunal”] in O.A. No.2108/2021.

3. We may note that, before instituting the above-captioned petition, respondent no.1 [i.e., the original applicant] had approached this court by way of another writ petition i.e., W.P.(C) No.11469/2021. At that point in time, with the consent of the counsel for the parties, the said writ petition was disposed of at the admission stage itself.

3.1. In the aforesaid writ petition, respondent no.1 had approached the court against an interlocutory order dated 27.09.2021, passed by the Tribunal in the very same O.A. i.e., O.A. No. 2108/2021.

3.2 To be noted, via the aforesaid O.A., respondent no.1 had assailed transfer order dated 27.08.2021, passed by respondent no.2 i.e., Deputy Commissioner, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (KVS), on multiple grounds.



NEUTRAL CITATION NO: 2022/DHC/000575

3.3. Since no interim protection was granted by the Tribunal, respondent no.1 was aggrieved that his O.A. [i.e., O.A. No. 2108/2021] will be rendered inefficacious.

3.4. It is in this context that we had observed that the Tribunal needs to examine the matter, and pass directions one way or the other, either with regard to the interim relief sought by respondent no.1 or in the alternative, render a decision in the main matter.

3.5. Furthermore, it is in this context that we had directed that the petitioner/KVS will maintain *status quo* till the Tribunal takes up the matter on the next date i.e., on 25.10.2021.

3.6. The judgment in the aforementioned writ petition was rendered on 06.10.2021.

4. Mr Anil Nag, who appears on behalf of the petitioner, says that because the Tribunal has not found time to examine the matter, the *status quo* continues to obtain, which works to the detriment of the petitioner.

5. To be noted, Mr Devesh Chauvia has joined the proceedings on behalf of respondent no.1.

5.1. The other respondents are official respondents, who are connected to the petitioner. Even according to Mr Nag, they are proforma respondents.

6. We are told that the matter is fixed before the Tribunal today i.e., 14.02.2022.

7. Given this position, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the Tribunal to deal with, if not the main matter, at least the interlocutory application filed in O.A. No.2108/2021, as directed [via judgment dated 06.10.2021, passed in W.P.(C) No.11469/2021].

7.1. If for any reason, the matter is not taken up today, the Tribunal endeavour to deal with the matter, as directed, within the next two weeks.

NEUTRAL CITATION NO: 2022/DHC/000575



8. Mr Nag says that the aforementioned directions should suffice, and that the writ petition can be closed.

8.1. Mr Chauvia assures the court that respondent no. 1 will cooperate with the Tribunal in the disposal of the matter.

9. The writ petition is, thus, disposed of, as noticed above, in the aforesaid terms.

10. Parties will act based on the digitally signed copy of this order.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

TALWANT SINGH, J.

FEBRUARY 14, 2022/tr

Click here to check corrigendum, if any